REMARKS

In the specification, the new paragraph [0224.1] added after paragraph [0224] clarifies that video segments, constructed as described, typically have differing numbers of frames.

Claims 17-25 remain in this application. Claims 1-16 have been cancelled without prejudice.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With regard to the cancellation of claims 1-16, Applicant is _not_ conceding that the subject matter encompassed by these claims was not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-16 were cancelled in this amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the subject matter of new claims 17-25. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 5 and 8 were objected to for informalities. Claims 5 and 8 have been cancelled. In view of the cancellation, applicant believes the objections are moot.

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 7,046,910). Applicant has cancelled claim 1, and has provided a new independent claim 17, which rephrases claim 1 to clarify its original limitations, and which introduces new limitations. The new limitations in claim 17 are supported by the specification at: paragraph [0027], line beginning "For the sake of completeness" to end of paragraph; paragraph [0029]; paragraph [0031]; paragraph [0224.1]; and paragraph [0226].

Chen describes a system that generates I-frames (complete, intra-coded video frames in a compressed format) from a particular type of video data stream: "progressive I-slice refreshed MPEG data streams." In

5 this type of data stream I-frames are distributed as slices within P-frames (prediction frames in a compressed format) of the stream. Chen recovers an I-frame from the I-slices, selects one of the P-frames of the stream, and replaces the selected P-frame with the recovered I-frame.

10 The P-frames are selected according to a "refresh rate" number of frames. The recovered I-frames are stored and indexed for later trick play display (col. 1, lines 48-66, col. 3, lines 24-38, and col. 5, lines 16-25). However, Chen neither teaches nor suggests decompressing

15 his recovered I-frames and displaying the decompressed frames for differing periods of time in order to achieve his trick play. Rather, the trick play described by Chen is achieved as described above.

New independent claim 17 recites receiving a video

20 stream, and processing the stream to determine respective representative frames of successive video segments in the stream. The video segments have differing numbers of frames in the segments. The representative frames are displayed for periods of time determined according to a

25 desired acceleration factor for the stream, and according to the number of frames in the corresponding segments.

As is recited in claim 17, the representative frames are displayed, and are thus totally different from the compressed I-frames and P-frames of Chen. Even assuming,

30 for the sake of argument, that the I-frames of Chen correspond with the representative frames recited in claim 17, and that the P-frames of Chen correspond with the video segments of claim 17, (the correspondences

given by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 1), there is no teaching or suggestion in the whole of Chen's disclosure that the periods of time during which different I-frames are displayed might <u>differ</u> from one to another, as determined in response to <u>numbers of video frames in the successive video segments</u>. This requirement is recited in claim 17.

Independent claim 17 is therefore believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 18-22 depend from claim 17. Dependent claims 18-22 include rephrased limitations of some of cancelled dependent claims 3-5, as well as new limitations. The new limitations are supported by the specification at paragraph [0041], sentence beginning: "The system analyzes… ."

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that claim 17 is not patentable, claims 18-22 are believed to recite independently patentable limitations. All dependent claims 18-22 select a number of video frames according to a frame-content of a representative frame differing from other frames by no more than a set of pre-selected thresholds. No such selection of numbers of frames is taught or suggested in Chen.

Dependent claim 23 depends from claim 17, and includes rephrased limitations of cancelled dependent claim 5. In claim 23 the first, second, and third elements of the claim correspond respectively to the third, fourth, and fifth elements of cancelled claim 5. In rejecting claim 5, the Examiner equated the third element of the claim with Chen's statement that "The extracted P-frames are <u>decoded</u> (step 102) to recover the I-slices which make up a complete I-frame" (col. 5, lines 32-34, emphasis added). However, the first element of

claim 23 recites "<u>determining</u> whether the first frame-content is similar to all the respective second frame-contents," and the second and third elements of the claim provide consequences depending whether the determination

5   is true or false. Chen's statement, and the whole of Chen's disclosure, shows neither teaching nor suggestion of such a <u>determination of similarity</u>, or steps to be taken according to the results of the determination, as are recited in claim 23. Claim 23 is therefore believed

10 to recite independently patentable limitations.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 23, and include rephrased limitations of cancelled dependent claims 6 and 7. In view of the patentability of claims 17 and 23, claims 24 and 25 are also believed to be patentable.

15 Applicant believes that the above amendments and remarks are fully responsive to all of the objections and grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims currently pending in the

20 present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

25 By: _/Suzanne Erez/_

Suzanne Erez

Reg. No. 46,688

Phone (972)4-8296069

Date: 2 April 2008

30 IBM Corporation

Intellectual Property Law Dept.

P. O. Box 218

Yorktown Heights, New York 10598,